



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/633,159	08/01/2003	Munenori Oizumi	TI-34626	5416
23494	7590	09/11/2009	EXAMINER	
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			ROSARIO, DENNIS	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2624			
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
09/11/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

[uspto@ti.com](mailto:uspto@ti.com)



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
10633159	8/1/2003	OIZUMI ET AL.	TI-34626
EXAMINER			
TEXAS INSTRUMENTS INCORPORATED P O BOX 655474, M/S 3999 DALLAS, TX 75265			
DENNIS ROSARIO			
ART UNIT      PAPER			
2624      20090904			

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

In response to the Order Remanding Appeal to Examiner, dated July 20, 2009, the examiner has analyzed claims 1-5 for subject matter eligibility under 35 U.S.C. 101. It is recognized that a process claim must pass the machine-or-transformation test for eligibility (a eligible claim may pass either prong: tied to a particular machine, or transform a particular article). The examiner has determined that claim 1 (and 2-5 by dependency) inherently require implementation by a particular machine based on the following considerations: Given the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claim in light of the specification, the computing, filtering and interpolating steps are not "manual" and/or "mental" steps. The specification discloses implementation by a particular machine absent a mental/manual embodiment, equivalent image processing in the prior art are machine implemented and do not involve manual/mental steps, the claim language "computing" and "filtering" are indicative of machine implementation. Given the state of the relevant art and applicant's own corresponding disclosure, it would not be reasonable to conclude that the claimed steps are manually or mentally performed, or somehow performed without a particular machine (e.g., dedicated hardware circuitry or a programmed processor). Likewise, the claims transform an "image" by "filtering" and "interpolation" into a different state, having a new or different use or function. Therefore, the examiner concludes that the claims in question pass the machine-or-transformation test, and are eligible under 35 U.S.C. 101.

/Bhavesh M Mehta/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2624